## Virginia Division of Consolidated Laboratory Services

PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS FROM POSITIVE EPA Method 5 D	PRESSURE FA	ABRI	C FI	LTERS	3
Facility Name:			\	ELAP	ID
Assessor Name:Analyst Name:		In	spec	ction Da	te
Relevant Aspect of Standards	Method Reference	Υ	Ν	N/A	Comments
Records Examined:					
Date of Analysis: Date(s) of Sample Preparati	on:	_ Ar	naly	st:	
If stainless steel probe nozzles were used, were they made of seamless tubing?	Method 5 6.1.1.1				
Were sampling temperature sensors capable of measuring to within ±3°C?	Method 5 6.1.1.7				
Were temperature sensors installed so that sensors were in direct contact with the sample gas?	Method 5 6.1.1.7				
Were the first, third, and fourth impingers modified to that a glass tube extended to about 1.3 cm from flask bottom?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
Did second impingers have standard tips?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
Did first and second impingers contain known quantities of water?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
Were third impingers empty?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
Did fourth impingers contain known quantities of silica gel?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
If particulate matters collected in impingers were measured, were sample trains setup exactly as dictated by the method?	Method 5 6.1.1.8				
If metering systems were used in conjunction with pitot tubes, did the systems allow for periodic checks of isokinetic rates?	Method 5 6.1.1.9				
Were barometers capable of measuring atmospheric pressure to within 2.5 mm Hg?	Method 5 6.1.2				
Notes/Comments:					

DGS-35-393 Effective 8/5/10 Page 1 of 4

## PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS FROM POSITIVE PRESSURE FABRIC FILTERS EPA Method 5 D Υ **Relevant Aspect of Standards** Method Ν N/A **Comments** Reference If weather station barometric pressure readings were used, were they adjusted for elevation differences Method 5 between station and sampling point at a rate of 2.5 6.1.2 mm Hg/30 m elevation? Did glass fiber filters exhibit at least 99.95% efficiency Method 5 in catching 0.3 micron dioctyl phthalate smoke 7.1.1 particles? If used on sources containing SO<sub>2</sub> or SO<sub>3</sub>, were the Method 5 filters unreactive to SO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>3</sub>? 7.1.1 Was reagent water ASTM D 1193-77 or 91 Type 3? Method 5 7.1.3 Did acetone have less than 0.001% residue and Method 5 7.2 come from the manufacturer in glass bottles?

Were filters checked against light for irregularities, flaws, or holes?	Method 5 8.1.2				
Were filters associated with their containers at all times?	Method 5 8.1.2				
Were filters desiccated at $20 \pm 5.6^{\circ}$ C at ambient temperature for 24 hours?	Method 5 8.1.3				
Were filters weighed to 0.1 mg at intervals of 6 hours to a ≤0.5 mg change?	Method 5 8.1.3				
Alternatively, were filters oven dried at 105°C for 2-3 hours, desiccated for 2 hours, and weighed? (No mention of constant weight)	Method 5 8.1.3				
Were filters exposed to atmosphere for a total of less than 2 minutes during each weighing?	Method 5 8.1.3				
	1	ı	1	ſ	

Method 5 8.2.2

Method 5

Method 5

Page 2 of 4

8.2.4

8.3.1

Method 5 7.2

Method 5

8.1.1

DGS-35-393 Effective 8/5/10

Were acetone blanks never subtracted from sample

Were silica gel aliquots weighed prior to introduction

Were nozzle sizes not changed during runs?

Were sampling times per point not less than 2

to assembly until just before sampling began?

Were all openings in sample trains closed from prior

values?

minutes?

Notes/Comments:

into to their impingers?

Relevant Aspect of Standards	Method Reference	Y	N	N/A	Comments
Was care taken to avoid putting enough silica gel in the fourth impingers to be entrained and carried away?	Method 5 8.3.1				
Were gloves or tweezers used to handle filters after preparation, weighing, and sampling?	Method 5 8.3.2				
Were filters checked for tears after sampling?	Method 5 8.3.2				
Vere O-rings used in filter-holders appropriately heat esistant?	Method 5 8.3.3				
silicone grease was used, was care taken to avoid ontaminating samples with it?	Method 5 8.3.4				
Was crushed ice placed around impingers at sampling?	Method 5 8.3.5				
Leak Checks					
Vere leak checks conducted on metering system orior to initial use and after each shipment?	Method 5 8.4.1				
Vere leaks in meter boxes corrected if found?	Method 5 8.4.1				
Vere leak checks conducted prior to component hanges on sample trains when components were hanged during runs?	Method 5 8.4.3				
Vere leaks corrected when above leak checks during ample runs were greater than the lesser of 0.00057 n <sup>3</sup> /min or 4% of the average sample rate?	Method 5 8.4.3				
Vere leak checks conducted at the conclusion of each sampling run at vacuums greater than or equal to the maximum value reached during the sample uns?	Method 5 8.4.4				
Vere leakage rates recorded, sample volumes corrected, or samples voided when post-run leak checks were greater than 0.00057 m <sup>3</sup> /min or 4% of the average sample rate?	Method 5 8.4.4				
Notes/Comments:					

DGS-35-393 Effective 8/5/10 Page 3 of 4

Procedure  Were dry gas meter readings recorded initially, after each sample time increment, when changes in flow rates were made, before and after leak checks, and at the conclusion of sampling?  Were flows adjusted to isokinetic conditions quickly after sampling began?  Was care taken not to bump probe nozzles into stack walls when sampling to avoid extracting deposited materials?  Were steps taken periodically during sample runs to keep temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 to 3 hours and cooled?  Nethod 5 to 11.2.1
Were dry gas meter readings recorded initially, after each sample time increment, when changes in flow rates were made, before and after leak checks, and at the conclusion of sampling?  Were flows adjusted to isokinetic conditions quickly after sampling began?  Was care taken not to bump probe nozzles into stack walls when sampling to avoid extracting deposited materials?  Were steps taken periodically during sample runs to keep temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Method 5 8.5.6  Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
Method 5 8.5.1  Were flows adjusted to isokinetic conditions quickly after sampling began?  Was care taken not to bump probe nozzles into stack walls when sampling to avoid extracting deposited materials?  Were steps taken periodically during sample runs to keep temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Method 5 8.5.6  Meth
Was care taken not to bump probe nozzles into stack walls when sampling to avoid extracting deposited materials?  Were steps taken periodically during sample runs to keep temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Method 5 8.5.6  Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
walls when sampling to avoid extracting deposited materials?  Were steps taken periodically during sample runs to keep temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Method 5 8.5.6  Method 5 8.5.6  Method 5 8.5.6  Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
temperature around filter holders at proper temperatures during sampling runs?  Were steps taken to maintain temperatures of less than 20°C at condenser/silica gel outlets during sampling runs?  Method 5 8.5.6  Method 5 8.5.6  Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
Analytical Procedure  Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
Were PM samples desiccated to constant weight differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
differences of no more than 0.5 mg or 1% with no less than 6 hours of desiccation between weighings?  Alternatively, were PM samples oven dried at 104°C for 2 Method 5
111211
Were liquid samples measured to ±1 mL volumetrically or ±0.5 g gravimetrically, desiccated for 24 hours, and weighed to a constant weight?  Method 5 11.2.1
Were silica gel portions weighed to the nearest 0.5 g?  Method 5 11.2.3
Were acetone blanks measured either gravimetrically or volumetrically and desiccated to a constant weight?  Method 5 11.2.4
Notes/Comments:

DGS-35-393 Effective 8/5/10 Page 4 of 4